

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 41-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 41-44 and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,661,531 to Murphy et al. ("*Murphy*"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0070672 to Iwami et al. ("*Iwami*"), and further in view of JP-A-2003-076649 to Iida ("*Iida*"); and allowed claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-30, and 37-39.

Applicant has amended claims 41, 48, and 49, and claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-30, 37-39, and 41-49 remain pending.

Regarding the rejection of claims 41-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner states that the Specification "does not describe that the printer 200 is a page printer" (Final Office Action at page 3). Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position.

This subject matter is described, for example, in paragraph 0044 of the Specification, which states "[t]he hard disk 204 stores various programs and data. The operating panel unit 205 is used for displaying various types of information and entering various instructions. The printing unit 206 prints various data on a recording element such as paper using a known image forming process such as an *electronic photography type process*" (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that an "electronic photography type" printer is a page printer. In addition, Applicant has

¹ The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

amended claims 41, 48, and 49 to recite “the page printer uses an electronic photography type process.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 41-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 41-44 and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murphy*, *Iwami*, and *Iida*.

Claims 41-44 and 46-49 require a “page printer” that “uses an electronic photography type process.” In contrast, the printers disclosed in *Murphy*, *Iwami*, and *Iida* are not page printers. They are ink jet printers that can print a page intermittently, and thus can print an image of the page part by part, depending upon the data transfer of the page. The printers disclosed in *Murphy*, *Iwami*, and *Iida* does not use “an electronic photography type process.” Therefore, the printing operations in *Murphy*, *Iwami*, and *Iida* do not teach or suggest the claimed “page printer” that “uses an electronic photography type process,” as recited in claims 41-44 and 46-49.

Accordingly, *Murphy*, *Iwami*, and *Iida* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 41-44 and 46-49, at least because the references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 29, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220